



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMAKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER 087664,238	FILING DATE 06/07/96	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT LUDWIG	ATTORNEY DOCKET N. VCOR-001/
COOLEY GODWARD CASTRO HUDDLESON & TATUM FIVE PALO ALTO SQUARE 3000 EL CAMINO REAL PALO ALTO CA 94306		LM21/0324	EXAMINER DINH, D
			ART UNIT 2756
			PAPER NUMBER 15
			DATE MAILED: 03/24/98

Below is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

ADVISORY ACTION

THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE:

a) is extended to run _____ or continues to run 3 mos from the date of the final rejection

b) expires three months from the date of the final rejection or as of the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

Appellant's Brief is due in accordance with 37 CFR 1.192(a).

Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed 7-26-98 has been considered with the following effect, but it is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

1. The proposed amendments to the claim and/or specification will not be entered and the final rejection stands because:
 - a. There is no convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the proposed amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented.
 - b. They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See Note).
 - c. They raise the issue of new matter. (See Note).
 - d. They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
 - e. They present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

2. Newly proposed or amended claims _____ would be allowed if submitted in a separately filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
3. Upon the filing an appeal, the proposed amendment will be entered will not be entered and the status of the claims will be as follows:

Claims allowed: _____

Claims objected to: _____

Claims rejected: _____

However;

Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): _____

4. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does not overcome the rejection because _____
see attachment

The proposed drawing correction has has not been approved by the examiner.

Other

DINH C. DUNG
PARENT EXAMINER

Dinh C. Dung

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that the examiner improperly modified Rangan and Vin references with the UNIX reference. Applicant asserted that the examiner entirely ignores the connection software disclosed in Rangan and Vin, and that modifying the Rangan and Vin system would render the system unsatisfactory for its intended purpose.

The argument is not persuasive because the connection software in Rangan and Vin are for controlling the physical connections of the Video conferencing equipment (e.g. video cameras). This software still need to get "user information" (i.e. user names, the station address where the user login, etc.) to route the video conferencing connections.

Rangan and Vin software are application running on a UNIX operating system. As shown by the UNIX reference provided in the last office action, the UNIX operating system has build in capability for tracking where a user login and the stations associated with the user. Hence, Rangan and Vin software inherently has the capability for retrieving the "user information" from the UNIX operating system. The examiner fail to see how doing this would render the Rangan system unsatisfactory for its intended purpose as argued by applicant.

Furthermore, the examiner in making the rejection has set forth objective reason why it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art would have the limitation claimed. Hence, the rejection is in conformance to the MPEP directive.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Dinh whose telephone number is (703) 305-9655. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00 AM - 4:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frank Asta can be reached at (703) 305-3817.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, DC 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

(703) 308-5359 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).



Dung Dinh
Patent Examiner
March 23, 1998